

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-24 were pending in the application with claims 3, 6, 10, 22, and 23 having been previously withdrawn. By this amendment, claims 1-5, 7, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, and 24 are amended and the applicants respectfully request reinstatement of claims 3, 6, 10, 22 and 23. Claims 3, 22, and 23 were not listed in this action as withdrawn, but are treated as such herein until formally reinstated. Thus, claims 1-24 remain pending. Independent claims 1, 7, 17 and 19 are amended as agreed to by the examiner in a phone interview. Dependent claims 2-5, 10-13, 14-15, 20-21 and 24 are amended to provide proper antecedent basis for terms therein due to the amendments of independent claims 1, 7, 17 and 19. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections are respectfully solicited in view of the foregoing amendments and the following arguments.

Initially, the applicants thank the examiner for recognition of the allowable subject matter in claim 7. Claim 7 is rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the claims from which it depended. As such, the applicants submit that claim 7 is now allowable. In view of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 comments below, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7.

Applicants' Interview Summary

*Int
Revised
OK
HAB
7-22-05*
The applicants thank the examiner for conducting a telephone interview. The interview was conducted on June 10, 2005, and the participants were Examiner Thompson, Bryan Lempia and Michael Chinlund.

Agreements were reached with the examiner regarding claim amendments that overcome the rejections. This paper reflects the substance of the interview and the agreement as to the claims.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

By this amendment, references to "a tipping moment" are removed from claims 1, 4, 5, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20 and 21 and the word "solely" is removed from claims 1 and 17. Additionally, the apparent ambiguity of claim 24 is resolved by the amendments to independent claim 17 from which claim 24 ultimately depends. Further, the examiner's